I. Xenophanes’ Sun in the Theophrastean Doxographers

Xenophanes evidently believed that the Sun was generated daily by the coalescence of bits on fire. This opinion is recorded in three II to III A.D. doxographies, all dependent on Theophrastos Physikai Doxai). Aëtios (2.20.3 = Xenoph. fr. 21 A 40 DK6) cites Theophrastos explicitly and states: εκ των συναθροιζομένων εκ τῆς ὑγρᾶς αναθυμίασεως, συναθροιζόντων δὲ τὸν ἢλιον. Here there seems to be contamination2) from Herakleitos fr. 22 A 1.9 DK (where ἀθροίζω and ἀναθυμίασις also occur together), for not elsewhere does ἀναθυμίασις appear in Xenophanes, though it is common with respect to Herakleitos (frr. A 1.9, 11, Α 11, and A 12 DK6); it does not scan and is probably Peripatetic in origin3). The συν-ἀθροίζειν is more likely Xenophanes4), as it scans, and is

4) Possibly once ἀθροίζειν in a B fr.: Emped. B 2.3 some MSS of Sextus. Otherwise only in A frr. (e.g., Anax. fr. A. 43.10, and four times in Xenophanes frr.
repeated in another version of Theophr. Phys. Dox., Hippolytos Ref. 1.14.3 (= fr. 21 A 33.3 DK6): τὸν δὲ ἢλιον ἐκ μικρῶν πυριδίων ἀθροιζομένων γίνεσθαι καθ’ ἐκάστῃ ἡμέραν. As συν-ἀθροίζειν is attested later than ἀθροίζειν (already in Archilochos), I would read the simplex. Also repeated is ἐκ [μικρῶν] πυριδίων (the μικρῶν I bracket as redundant), and of course τὸν ἢλιον. Perhaps a sort of common denominator Urtext could be suggested for Theophrastos: Ξ. <Ἑλεγε> τὸν ἢλιον ἐκ πυριδίων ἀθροιζομένων γίνεσθαι καθ’ ἐκάστῃ ἡμέραν. Xenophanes can not have written any form of πυριδίων, as none will scan (the other words in the reconstructed Urtext will).

The last phrase is only in the second version, but seems likely. A further idea is found in the third version: [Plut.] Strom. 4 (= fr. 21 A 32 DK6): φησὶ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἢλιον, ἐκ μικρῶν καὶ πλειόνων πυριδίων ἀθροίζεσθαι ... τὸν δὲ ἢλιον φησι καὶ τὰ ἀστρα ἐκ τῶν νεφῶν γίνεσθαι. The νεφῶν here are evidently the inflamed clouds of Xenophanes fr. A 38 (= Aëtios 2.13.14): ἐκ νεφῶν ... πεπυρωμένων. That fragment adds the comparison to coals: σφιννυμένως δὲ καθ’ ἐκάστῃ ἡμέραν [as in A 33.3] ἀναζωπυρεῖν νύκτωρ καθάπερ τοὺς ἀνδρακες: τὰς γὰρ ἀνατολάς καὶ τὰς δύσεις ἐξάψεις εἶναι καὶ σβέσεις. This suggests a possibility (and no more) for the Xenophanean original of Theophrastos’ πυριδίων—perhaps the σπινθήρ of II. 4.77, Pindar’s φλογὸς σπέρμα (Ol. 7.48), uel sim.5)?

A 32, 33, and 40)—but already in Archilochos frs. 60, 104 Bergk4, Aischyllos Pers. 414, Sophokles OT 144, Herodotos 5.101.2, Euripides Her. 122, Ion 1147, IA 87, 267, Rhes. 613, Aristophanes Aes 253, Lys. 585, Thukydides 1.50.3 and 5.6.4, Plato Phaedo 67c8, 70a7, 80e5, 83a8, Prot. 322b6, Rep. 563d5, Tim. 63b3, and often in Xenophon and Aristotle. The compound σω- first in Aristophanes Lys. 585 and Euripides (?) Rhes. 613.

5) The word ζωτυχον ‘spark’ is (or at least its derivatives are) well attested in the V B. C.: Aischyllos Theb. 290, Agam. 1034, and Hippokrates Vict. 1.9 ζωτυρέω; Euripides Electa 1121 ἀνα-ζω-, in tmesi. But the noun ζωτυρον itself not before Plato Laws 677b2 (and twice in Arist.: de Caelo 308a2 and PA 670a25). Plato or Xenophon provide the earliest ἀνα-ζω-, not in tmesi: Charm. 156d2, Rep. 527e1; Hell. 5.4.46, Eq. 10.16. Still ζωτυχον might have been used (and will scan). Moreover, the Hippokratic de Victa in which the word appears is known to display Herakleitean influence—fr. 22 C 1 DK6 and G.S. Kirk, Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments (Cambridge 1954), 21, 26-9—could this be a clue? On the other hand, ζ. is a favorite of the ecclesiastical writers (from II Tim 1:16), Philo Iudaíos and Plutarch: perhaps it was imported by Aëtios?